

MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 3, 1925.

The first meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1926 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building, on Thursday, September 3, 1925.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Greenleaf,
Mr. Ayres,
Mr. Mowbray,
Mr. Medary,
Mr. Delano,
Mr. Taft,

also Mr. H. P. Gammenger, Secretary

and Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the meeting held May 21, 1925, were approved.
2. VERMONT SOUVENIR COIN: Under date of September 1, 1925, the following letter was received from the Director of the Mint, submitting to the Commission of Fine Arts a photograph of models prepared by Mr. Sherry Fry, sculptor for the Vermont souvenir coin:

"The enclosed photograph is that of the proposed designs to be used for the souvenir half dollar authorized by Act of Congress approved February 24, 1925, to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Bennington and the independence of Vermont.

The designs are submitted for your judgment as to their artistic merits and the appropriateness of the same for the events intended to be commemorated.

This Bureau has been instructed by the President of the Bennington Battle Monument and Historical Association to accept this photograph of designs executed by Mr. Sherry Fry for the consideration of your Commission and the Department of the Treasury.

Please return the photographs with your decision in regard to them."

The Commission examined the design. The Commission objected particularly

as to the manner in which the associations, commissions and the like, that receive authority from Congress for producing a souvenir coin, are being submitted to the Mint and then to the Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission urged that the design be submitted in its earliest stages instead of after a model has been made, so as to save the time of the artist. Mr. Moore suggested taking up this matter with the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures of the House.

Mr. Fry had made the design according to instructions from the Vermont State Sesqui-Centennial Commission. Mr. Taft said: I think it is well handled, well placed, the spotting is good". He called attention to the misspelling of the word Bennington. Why they should take a monument commemorating a historical event in the War of 1812, as it appeared, for one side of the coin and on the other the head of a Revolutionary soldier, was not understood.

The Commission advised that the lettering be improved, that the reverse be restudied, and made other recommendations which were embodied in a report to the United States Mint. (Exhibit A).

3. SESQUICENTENNIAL COINS: The secretary reported that under date of May 6, 1925, the Commission made suggestions to the Sesquicentennial International Exposition Commission at Philadelphia, in accordance with their request as to the production of commemorative coins authorized by Congress, and that not having heard from them as to what was being done in the matter, he had asked Mr. Medary to make inquiry about them.

Mr. Medary stated that Mr. McAlleer, secretary of the Exposition Commission, had informed him that the new designer at the Philadelphia Mint is at work on the designs, which have not yet proved satisfactory; and that further effort will be made at the coming session of Congress to secure

authority for minting a \$1.50 souvenir coin; that it had been their desire to have 15 different souvenir coins made. Mr. Medary said he advised Mr. McAlleer that it was the desire of the Commission of Fine Arts to have the designs submitted before they are prepared fully.

It was suggested that a letter be written to the Director of the Mint asking him as to the average number sold of the souvenir coins that had been recently made, as the Stone Mountain, the Horse-American, the Haguenot-Balloon, the Vancouver, and the ^{California} Diamond Jubilee coins. The Commission felt that souvenir coins are beneath the dignity of the United States, and that this is a matter which also should be taken up with the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures of the House. The Commission felt that souvenir coins should be more strictly limited to events of great national historical interest.

4. ST. NAZAIRE MEMORIAL: The American Battle Monuments Commission submitted letters, under date of August 11 and August 24, together with photographs of the memorial, advising that the St. Nazaire Memorial Association had been stopped by the French government in the erection of the memorial, demanding the approval of the American Battle Monuments Commission, although the work of casting and erecting the memorial was under way. In accordance with the Act creating that Commission, the matter was submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts. Copies of the correspondence and photographs were forwarded to the members of the Commission, and information having been received that a small scale model of the memorial was in the studio of the sculptor, Mrs. Harry Payne Whitney, several of the members of the Commission went to see it. The monument is to commemorate the landing of the first American troops in France in 1917, and is to be dedicated June 26, 1926. It is to be erected in the harbor of St. Nazaire. The monument consists of a soldier, 15 feet high, standing on an eagle; the spread

of the eagle's wings is about 30 feet.

Mr. Medary said the change in the design spoken of by Major Price in his letter of August 11th to the Chief Clerk of the American Battle Monuments Commission does not appear in any of the models available in this country, but will tend materially to solidify the composition at the point where the bronze eagle and the granite rock adjoin. The eagle appears as though about to dive into the sea, though according to the letter from Major Price, the soldier (and consequently the eagle) will face the town and have his back to the sea.

The Commission regretted that the design had not been brought to their attention in its earliest stages, as the monument might be improved. The Commission did not favor the idea of placing the soldier on the back of the eagle, being a mixture of realism and symbolism.

The Commission felt that if the design for this memorial had been submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts in its preliminary stages, as designs for other World War Memorials in Europe will be submitted in the future, this Commission would have made some suggestions for change of the design. But this not having been done and the work of erecting this memorial being under way, the Commission recommended that the American Battle Monuments Commission permit the completion of the work. The American Battle Monuments Commission was advised accordingly (Exhibit B).

5. COAST GUARD MEMORIAL: Under date of August 18, 1925, the Commission received a letter from Commander J. W. Wheeler, Chairman of the Executive Committee for the Coast Guard World War Memorial, requesting advice as to a design. The memorial is to commemorate 195 of their World War dead, and it is desired to erect it in Arlington. A fund of \$10,000 is available for it, and

this may be increased to about \$20,000. The advice and cooperation of the Commission in the matter was requested.

The Commission expressed their interest in the project and felt that an appropriate place for it could be found in the World War section in Arlington. Mr. Moore suggested a fountain, saying there are no fountains in Arlington. Mr. Taft raised the question whether or not it would be desirable to interest the American Beaux Arts Institute in this matter. Mr. Medary felt that a competition for this particular purpose would not be as satisfactory as the employment of some one of large experience and who would give special study to the design. If the design is to take the form of a fountain, Mr. Medary said, then it seemed to him the problem of design is primarily an architectural one, in connection with which a sculptor might, however, be consulted.

The Commission suggested that Mr. Moore have a conference with the Coast Guard War Memorial Committee on the subject (Exhibit C). Mr. Moore said he had in mind the beautiful fountain that Edsel Ford has in Detroit.

Mr. Greenleaf stressed the point that in this matter of fountains the idea is generally put in the design that there must be a brilliant display or burst of water, whereas a trickle of water with a quiet pool reflecting a significant object, with a quiet background, is perfectly practicable and is generally far more attractive than the idea of grandeur which is generally put into the design.

6. LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR HOWARD UNIVERSITY: Dr. E. J. Scott, Secretary-Treasurer of Howard University, and their architect Mr. Albert I. Cassell, appeared before the Commission with a plan for the grounds of the University, made pursuant to special recommendations received from Mr. Greenleaf on the subject. Dr. Scott read the following letter, which was submitted with the plan:

"Following the recent visit of the Commission of Fine Arts to the

University Campus we received Mr. Greenleaf's sketches suggesting a treatment for the East slope of the University Campus.

This suggested treatment embodying a retaining wall; a fifty foot wide terrace approximately eight hundred feet long; a walk lined with elm trees; sodding, grading and planting has been carefully studied with a view to determining its cost.

The cost of the retaining wall constructed according to the sketch and properly drained and reinforced was first studied. All of the land in the stretch on which it is proposed to construct the wall is a fill on top of a former dump. This fill is from eight to ten years of age. In order to secure a proper foundation, the height of the wall not including the concrete parapet proposed, would be from twentyeight to thirty feet throughout the greater portion of its length. It is estimated that the shortest length of such wall it would be possible to build and carry out the scheme would contain approximately eight hundred cubic yards of concrete, exclusive of the necessary concrete coping. This wall reinforced and drained as directed would cost at least \$20.00 per yard in place, that is \$16,000.00 exclusive of the 18" x 2'-8" coping, with oak posts and proper guard rail.

Further cost to be encountered would be extensive grading at \$.60 per yard; soil for the elms, lawns and planting at \$2.00 to \$3.00 per yard; sodding or proper seeding at 75¢ per yard and the cost of the construction of walks indicated together with the cost of the growth itself.

The cost of the shortest possible stretch of retaining wall would be \$6,000.00 more than the total sum we have for these improvements. We have some \$10,500.00 for this work. It will not be possible to obtain more funds for this purpose. The President of the University, who was anxious for the treatment under discussion has been informed of the cost involved, with the result that he advises the submission of an alternate layout.

The University authorities therefore respectfully request your criticism of the alternate layout submitted herewith. This layout contemplates a treatment similar to that employed on the East side of the reservoir, where terraces, lawns and planting form the basis of the layout. The attached photographs show the development of the East side of the reservoir referred to.

Very respectfully yours,

Emmett J. Scott, Secretary-Treasurer.

Dr. Scott said that they have found that to carry out the suggestions received for the big landscape plan would require at least \$40,000, whereas only \$10,500 is at hand, and Representative Crampton, in charge of their appropriations had informed him that that is all that would be appropriated for this purpose. Mr. Greenleaf said that this work of laying out the grounds should be kept on a scale in keeping with the future development of the University, and asked whether it would not be best to begin a portion of the work, as putting in

the foundation of the retaining wall, leaving it for later years to finish the work. Dr. Scott replied that the University must show when contracts for this work are let that something definite is being accomplished and that a contract for a part of the retaining wall would not be permitted. Dr. Scott said the Budget Bureau has already cut the preliminary estimates and the Appropriations Committee might reduce them still more.

Mr. Moore inquired whether or not it would be possible to relocate the road adjacent to the University grounds over towards the Reservoir and suggested that this be looked into, because even if only a short stretch of road could be moved it might save on retaining walls. Mr. Moore felt there was a great deal of waste space between the road and the Reservoir, at the foot of the hill. Dr. Scott said that at present there is a low level and a high level road there, which was built two years ago, and it would be costly to remove any portion of it, but that he would see what could be done about it.

Dr. Scott requested advice as to what should be done with the alternate plan submitted and called attention to the fact that the campus is so large that the amount available could well be used for the grounds proper. The idea of the axis and relating the buildings to it had been preserved in the plan. Mr. Greenleaf said the University should not give up the idea of some day carrying out the big landscape plan for the University as it has heretofore been considered, and that in the meantime with the fund available they should use it in such a way as to carry out that plan as far as possible. The Commission endorsed Mr. Greenleaf's recommendation (Exhibit D).

7. McKINLEY MANUAL TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL: Mr. A. L. Harris, Municipal Architect, submitted sketches for McKinley Manual Training High School, including one for the tower. The architect members of the Commission examined the sketches and noted changes on them, which Mr. Harris will embody in the plan.

8. POLICE STATION NO. 15: Mr. Morris submitted a design for Police Station No. 15. Criticism was made of the 'viaduct' indicated in the plan; instead of the arch treatment the Commission suggested piers with lintel.

9. NEW STREET TROLLEY POLES FOR CONNECTICUT AVENUE: Major J. H. Holcombe, Assistant to the Engineer Commissioner, and Mr. W. B. Hadley, District Electrical Engineer, appeared before the Commission with a suggested plan for a new street pole on Connecticut Avenue to replace the present center poles. The new poles will be placed along the curbs and are to serve 3 purposes-- to hold lamps (staggered), electric wires, and street railway wires of the Capital Traction Company.

Mr. Hadley said the sketch he was submitting was not satisfactory to him and he wanted the advice of the Commission as to how the problem could be solved. Mr. Delano suggested a double light lamp post to offset the awkward appearance of the single light. A question was raised as to the width of the cross arm. It was admitted that the poles and wires would come in conflict with the trees, and the Commission did not favor a fixture of this character which would mar the beauty of the Avenue.

The Commission recommended that a study be made, in which the design is treated as a unit, and submitted at the next meeting of the Commission.

10. PATENT OFFICE, CHANGE IN SOUTH FRONT: Under date of August 20th the Commission was informed by letter from the Commissioner of Patents that an attempt was being made by the Merchants and Manufacturers Association of Washington to have F Street widened between Seventh and Ninth Streets so as to take up part of the grounds on the south side of the Patent Office and necessitate reconstruction of the entrance and that plans to effect this had been prepared and a letter written by Colonel Sherrill to Secretary Hoover

recommending the change.

The Commission visited the Patent Office in the afternoon and were determined that nothing should be done to mutilate the building. The Commission noted, however, that the reconstruction of the entrance on the south side is of a later period than that of the original building. If therefore F Street must be widened between Seventh and Ninth Streets to meet traffic conditions, a careful study should be made of the proposed change on the south side of the building. The Commission objected to making any change in this entrance unless it could be done adequately, and requested that a complete set of working drawings be submitted to them. It occurred to the Commission that instead of the present series of steps there might possibly be a pylon for the central motive, with the grass terrace brought to the outer line of the steps indicated on the sketch submitted. (Exhibit D).

11. **FILTRATION PLANT:** Mr. Moore called the attention of the architect members of the Commission to a copy of specifications for the New Filtration Plant, received from Major O'Connor. The architect members of the Commission felt that there had been a change made in the ^{approved} plan of the tower. The termination of the tower should be revised so as to leave off the pediments. Mr. Delano sketched a tower, and Mr. Moore said he would bring it to the attention of Major O'Connor.

12. **MASONIC INSURANCE BUILDING:** Mr. Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, accompanied by a representative of the Insurance Department of the Masons' Fraternity, came to the Commission to request advice and help in procuring proper designs for two new buildings to occupy the present sites of the Smith Lumber Yard and a Feed Warehouse, at First Street and Indiana Avenue, N.W. These sites are to be occupied by an insurance building and apartment house

to accommodate Masonic officials and employees in the insurance department. The insurance people came to the Commission because they felt they were occupying a site within the dominance of the Capitol and they desire to recognize in their buildings that dominance. They were assured of the sympathy and cooperation of the Commission.

13. FORT DRIVE: Mr. Greenleaf inspected plans on September 2nd at the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks, at the New Navy Building, prepared by Mr. J. G. Langdon, Landscape Architect of the National Capital Park Commission, for the Fort Drive. Other proposed park plans were also inspected. The question arose whether these plans would be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts. The secretary, who accompanied Mr. Greenleaf, called attention to the Executive Order of July 28, 1921, that important plans for parks shall be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. F. G. Coldren, Attorney for the National Capital Park Commission, informed the Commission at the meeting, through the secretary, that the park plans would be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts and that arrangements would be made for a trip of inspection with members of the Park Commission at the next meeting.

14. RESTORATION, ARLINGTON MANSION: Mr. Moore stated that Acting Secretary of War Davis had expressed the desire that the Commission of Fine Arts inspect articles contemplated for the Arlington Mansion in the restoration to be effected in accordance with the Act approved March 4, 1925 (Public Resolution No. 74, 68th Congress), and he had informed Secretary Davis that the Commission would be willing to make such inspections.

Accordingly, the following letter was received from the Acting Quartermaster

General, dated September 2, 1925:

"Request has been made by The Acting Secretary of War that the Fine Arts Commission decide upon the suitability of articles to be used in the restoration of the Lee Mansion at the Arlington National Cemetery, and there is now under consideration the acceptance of a painting by Douglas Grant, illustrating the last stanza of the poem entitled, 'The Flag', by Isabel Dickens Gates, which has been offered to the Government by Mr. Hosea B. Moulton, Commander, Department of the Potomac, G. A. R.

The advice of the Commission as to the suitability of this painting for acceptance will be greatly appreciated, and if you will be good enough to act in the matter, arrangements will be made for its inspection at such time as may be convenient both to you and the donor."

The Commission advised that the painting in question did not come within the purview of the Act, which is specific in stating that the Arlington Mansion shall be restored to what it was prior to the Civil War. The Quartermaster General was advised accordingly (Exhibit F).

15. NEW U. S. CONSERVATORY: On September 2nd, Mr. Greenleaf, accompanied by Mr. Caemmerer, was in consultation with Mr. George W. Hess, Director of the U. S. Botanic Garden, as to a location for his new Conservatory, south of the Hall, as contemplated by the Act approved January 7, 1925 (Public Resolution No. 42, 66th Congress).

Mr. Greenleaf advised

that Mr. Hess stated the new Conservatory is to house his largest plants and it would cost a million dollars to build it. Several locations had suggested themselves--in particular the area immediately south of the Capitol, which, however, was thought prohibitive because of large buildings, such as Congress Hall, on the ground; the other site contemplates taking in several squares south of Maryland Avenue, including the Willow Tree Alley Playground, from C Street north to Maryland Avenue, and Four and One-half Street east to the Capitol grounds; the Conservatory would be located on the playground site, which it was said is not much used.

Mr. Greenleaf felt that in an important project as this he would want to see a magnificent display of flowers near the Capitol in keeping with the dignity of the United States; that he would prefer a large tract of ground for these gardens, possibly 50 acres, south of the Capitol, and related to it, but that if it is not possible to get that site Mr. Greenleaf said an interesting garden could be developed on the grounds south of Maryland Avenue at the site suggested. The matter is to be considered further with the Committees of the Library, of Congress, which have jurisdiction over the Botanic Garden.

16. U. S. FLAG STANDARDIZATION: At the request of Mr. Howbray, representatives of the Committee on Flag Standardization met at the Bureau of Standards for the special purpose to consider the question of colors for the United States flag, in connection with the general problem of flag standardization. The meeting, which was held on Friday, September 4th, was very satisfactory to Mr. Howbray. A color expert of the Bureau of Standards is to make necessary tests. A report of the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes.

17. SUCCESSOR TO MR. LYDES: At the suggestion of Mr. Lydes, the Commission considered further the question of his successor. The names of architects in leading cities east of the Mississippi River were mentioned, among them Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis. It was thought that although there are good architects west of the Mississippi River, it would be too far for an architect to travel from that part of the country to attend the meetings of the Commission. Architects Coolidge, Morris, Garfield and Cross were especially considered. Mr. Abram Garfield, of Cleveland, it was thought would be very much interested in the work here in Washington, having lived in the White House. The matter is to be considered further at the next meeting.

18. THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK COMMISSION: By letter dated August 14, 1935, the National Capital Park Commission requested the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to the purchase of Lot 800 in Square East of Square 1500, the tract lies south of the junction of Thirty-fifth Street and Wisconsin Avenue, exactly at the point where the roadway connecting the Glenside and Monrovia Parks in Potomac Park Valley with the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway should cross Wisconsin Avenue.

By letter dated August 31, 1935, the National Capital Park Commission requested the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to the acquisition of the following tracts:

1. The square bounded by 13th, 4th, Whittier and Wisconsin Streets, northwest, as parcel 115/95. This tract lies south of Eastern Park, has considerable shade and a fine spring, and that section is entirely unimproved with park or playground space.
2. Also, the site of Fort Seward, one of the Civil War forts, located where the River Road crosses the District line, and including parcels 25/17, 25/18, 25/22, 25/38 and 25/41. This tract has a fine elevation, has some tree growth, and is a section wholly unimproved with park reservations.
3. Also lots 1, 2, 3, 14, to 18 inclusive, and 601 to 605, inclusive, in Square 1512 south. This tract borders on the east the land owned by Mrs. Anne Arnold, and extends from Reservoir Road north to the very beautiful oak grove, a portion of which has already been acquired by the National Capital Park Commission.
4. Also, lot 804 in Square 5366, and lot 9 in Square 4005. These lots include the site of Fort Baker Hill, just north of Brookland and the forest slope extending eastward from the Fort site proper.
5. Also, part of the tract heretofore called "Wilson Park", lying on the south side of the property of the St. Elizabeth Hospital, extending from Nichols Avenue westward. This is covered by a very fine oak forest, and is particularly attractive for park purposes.
6. Also, square 1982, also known as parcel 46/14, being the small triangle on the west side of Connecticut Avenue at Ellicott Street.

The Commission decided to inspect these sites at an early opportunity and report to the National Capital Park Commission concerning them at a later date.

The Commission made a trip of inspection in the afternoon to Meridian Hill Park, and saw the Statue of Serenity in place. The Commission advised that the statue should be placed amidst planting. An inspection was then made of the Patent Office grounds, and the site proposed for the new Conservatory. The Commission saw the fountain at the Lincoln Memorial playing, but felt there were too many spouts, and objected to the idea of the fountain obstructing the view from Seventeenth Street to the Lincoln Memorial. An inspection was made also of the model of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway in the new Navy Building. After an interval of an hour, the Commission resumed their discussions in the evening, and adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

COPY

September 5, 1925.

Dear Miss O'Reilly:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on September 3, 1925, considered the sketch submitted for the Vermont souvenir coin.

The Commission recommend that the lettering be restudied. In the sketch it is lacking in that distinction which has been achieved in the recent coinage of the United States. It is presumed that the choice of the head of Ira Allen as the representative of Vermont has been made by due authority. The Commission do not question the historical accuracy of the choice, but merely call attention to the desirability of having the matter settled officially. Ira Allen having been chosen as the representative, it would seem necessary to make the reverse of the coin correspond. The monument selected for the reverse commemorates a battle in the War of 1812 and not in any way connected officially with Vermont. Moreover, the Commission suggests that for artistic reasons also the reverse of the model be restudied. This souvenir coin, being designed to represent the President's own State, should have special consideration and should be as near perfect as it is possible for the artist to make it. Of course it is desirable to change the spelling of Bennington to conform to current usage.

The photograph is herewith returned in accordance with your request.

Sincerely yours,

Miss M. M. O'Reilly,
Acting Director of the Mint,
Treasury Department.

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT A

Vol. 100, Part 1, 1970

Edited by J. H. REES, F.R.S.

Published by the Royal Anthropological Institute

Subscription price, including postage, £12.00 per volume

Single parts, £3.00 each

Orders, which must be accompanied by payment, may be sent to any bookseller or to the publishers

Printed by the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset by the University Press, Cambridge

Printed in Great Britain

Copyright © 1970 by the Royal Anthropological Institute

Reproduction of this journal in any form without the written permission of the publishers is prohibited

Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y.

Postmaster: send address changes in U.S.A. and possessions to the publishers

Subscription orders from outside the U.S.A. and possessions should be sent to the publishers

Orders for single parts should be sent to the publishers

Orders for back volumes should be sent to the publishers

Orders for advertising should be sent to the publishers

Printed in Great Britain

Published by the Royal Anthropological Institute

100, Part 1, 1970

Edited by J. H. REES, F.R.S.

Published by the Royal Anthropological Institute

Subscription price, including postage, £12.00 per volume

Single parts, £3.00 each

Orders, which must be accompanied by payment, may be sent to any bookseller or to the publishers

ATP 100(1) 70

COPY FOR:

September 18, 1925.

Dear Mr. Spargo:

I have your letter of September 18. Please let me say at the beginning that we mistook the Bennington monument for the Battle of Lake Champlain monument and we thought you had made a slip in your history, as not unfrequently happens, Congress itself on one occasion having fallen into a mistake in regard to the Star Spangled Banner monument. The Commission was under no misapprehension as to the historical place of the Battle of Bennington, and doubtless you know many differences between the two monuments.

Of course there may be a difference of opinion as to whether the monument forms a suitable basis for the design of one side of the coin. The Commission of Fine Arts thought it did not, but putting all minor matters aside, the Commission felt that Sherry Fry had it in him to produce a very handsome coin and that he had not done so. The Commission felt that this was in part the fault of the restrictions placed upon the artist in the subject of his design.

The Commission approved the Ira Allen head but were not satisfied with the lettering on the coin. The Commission were the more anxious to have this coin right, inasmuch as it represents the President's own State.

Yours very truly,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. John Spargo, President,
Vermont State Sesqui-Centennial Commission,
Bennington, Vermont.

EXHIBIT 6

COPY

September 4, 1925.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of August 18th, requesting the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to your proposed World War Memorial in the Arlington National Cemetery, received very careful consideration at their meeting on September 3, 1925.

There are matters pertaining to type of design and location which it would be well to discuss with your committee. I would be pleased to meet with your committee some time in the near future to talk over these matters.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Commander W. J. Wheeler, Chairman,
Executive Committee,
Coast Guard World War Memorial,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT C.

September 9, 1925.

Dear Dr. Scott:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on September 3, 1925, gave careful consideration to your letter of that date, and to the alternate study submitted therewith for the proposed treatment of the east slope of the Howard University grounds.

The Commission noted your statement that only \$10,500 is at hand for this development, whereas to carry out the recommendations of the Landscape architect member of the Commission, Mr. James M. Greenleaf, which the Commission of Fine Arts approve, for a comprehensive development of the grounds, including a retaining wall on the east slope of the campus, with a broad terraced walk, would cost at least \$40,000.

The Commission advise that the plan of development heretofore recommended should be adhered to. It is an important feature in the development of the University, and its desirability will be increased more and more as Vermont Avenue is opened between U Street and Georgia Avenue, making a direct approach to the University and placing the University on one of the main lines of travel extending from the center of the city to northeast Washington.

The Commission suggest that the fund available be used to carry out the main Landscape plan of the University as far as possible. The Commission feel that possibly the expense of a retaining wall may be avoided if a portion of the roadway between the campus and the reservoir could be moved over towards the reservoir, or a strip of the parking be allotted to the University, and it is suggested that this matter be taken up with the District United States

Engineer Officer.

Dr. Emmett J. Scott,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Howard University,
Washington, D.C.

Very respectfully, yours,
Charles Moore,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT D.

September 7, 1935.

Dear Mr. Commissioner:

Your letter of August 30th, in regard to the proposed widening of F Street by clipping off a portion of the ground of the Patent Office, received the consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts during their meeting on September 7, 1935.

The Commission made an examination of the situation and appreciate the congestion caused by the jog in F Street. The Commission also considered the fact that the F Street entrance to the Patent Office was changed in order to conform to the new grades established for F Street during the reign of Alexander V. Shepherd. The changes then made in the F Street front were inharmonious and badly designed. The Commission were convinced that in the hands of an architect as capable as Clark Mills and Thomas U. Walter, who designed the Patent Office, a change in the entrance could be made which would enhance the value of the building and at the same time permit a widening of F Street. If, however, the change shall be made simply for the sake of widening the street, without reference to the design of the building, one of the chief architectural features of the City of Washington will suffer seriously. These things being considered it may be found that the cost of the change will be out of proportion to the advantage to be gained, especially in view of the many other congested streets which may equally have attention and an expenditure with more adequate results.

The sketches accompanying your letter could not be approved by the Commission. If further sketches shall be made, the Commission will be pleased to see them.

Very respectfully, yours,
Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Hon. Thomas E. Robertson,
Commissioner of Patents,
Department of Commerce.

EXHIBIT E

COPY

September 7, 1925.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of September 2, stating that a painting by Douglas Grant, illustrating the last stanza of the poem entitled "The Flag" by Isabel Likens Gates, has been offered to the Government by Mr. Hosea B. Moulton, Commander of the Potomac, G. A. R., to be hung in the Arlington Mansion, has been received.

Under the terms of the Act providing for the restoration of the Arlington Mansion, only articles which were in the house prior to the Civil War or copies of them may be accepted. The Act is so specific in its terms that the offer of the painting adverted to would have to be declined.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The Quartermaster General,
War Department,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT F.

Special Committee Meeting at the Bureau of Standards
Concerning Flag Standardization, Sept. 4, 1925.

On Friday, September 4, 1925, representatives of the Flag Standardization Committee and experts of the Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, met at the Bureau at the request of Mr. H. Siddons Mowbray, painter member of the Commission of Fine Arts, for a conference particularly as to the question of color of the United States flag, in connection with the general problem of the flag now before the Committee and the Commission of Fine Arts. There were present: Dr. George K. Burgess, Director of the Bureau of Standards; Dr. F. C. Brown, Assistant Director; Mr. H. Siddons Mowbray, Commission of Fine Arts; Mr. Edwin W. Ely, Acting Chief Clerk, Division of Simplified Practice, representing Mr. Hudson; Capt. W. G. DuBose, Navy Department; Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary, Commission of Fine Arts; Mr. F. R. McGowan, former Chief of Textile Section, Bureau of Standards; and the following from the Bureau of Standards--Mr. W. D. Appel, Dye Expert; Mr. I. G. Priest, Color Expert; Mr. C. W. Schoffstall of the Textile Section and Mr. W. E. Emley, Assistant Division Chief. Captain H. D. Vigor, of the War Department, was unavoidably absent. Dr. Burgess was Chairman of the meeting.

The discussion opened with a brief statement by Mr. Mowbray, in which he said that he welcomed the opportunity to talk with the committee on the question of color for the United States flag, since it was the most important question now pending in the problem of Flag Standardization. Mr. Mowbray said in the flag now in use both the red and blue are unpleasant types of colors, the red has a tendency to the violet, and the blue containing an element of red and verges towards black. When perfectly new the combination of these two shades is disagreeable to the eye and they are already in the first stage of neutralization. Moreover, the reaction of these colors, one to the other, is weak and continually weakens as the flag wears. "The red I have chosen, verging on the orange," Mr. Mowbray said, "is free from the blue element; the blue will therefore be purer, with less red. This is more apparent as we consider the colors in a spectrum. The scientific order of primary and secondary colors is yellow, orange, red, violet, blue, green, yellow, etc. There is consequently a red into which yellow or orange enters and likewise one verging into the violet or blue. There is likewise a blue that is similarly affected and which becomes either a violet or green from its proximity to red or yellow. The effectiveness of each of these colors hinges on their reaction one to another. It also affects their carrying power and their durability. A red tending towards orange reacts in a stronger manner to a blue than a red tending towards violet. The red I have chosen and which the Commission has approved is called in the arts Chinese Vermilion; the blue is a lighter and more brilliant blue with less red in it.

Samples of the proposed red and blue were submitted to the Navy Department and they prepared for the Commission of Fine Arts a sample flag in these colors, though the red was not exactly in accordance with the sample. The superiority in point of beauty was immediately evident. The colors now used seemed dull and dark, especially the blue, which was almost black in comparison, whereas in the sample flag they were vibrant and luminous. The more perfect reaction of the new colors one to the other will preserve the flag's brightness longer than those in present use. I have noted flags with the present colors this morning particularly. There was a good deal of blue in the sky, but the blue of the

present flag looks practically black."

Two large flags heretofore furnished the Commission of Fine Arts by the Navy Department--one in the existing colors and the other in the proposed shades of red and blue--were placed in the room for inspection by the committee.

Capt. DuBose inquired of Mr. Mowbray as to the shades of red and blue selected, in comparison with those produced in the sample flag, to which Mr. Mowbray replied that he had brought samples of the colors--the red is more brilliant.

Mr. Appel said he had not seen the colors selected by Mr. Mowbray until this meeting, that there are a large number of red and blue dyes no two of which produce exactly the same color, and that many advantages would result if the red and blue colors selected for the flag could be produced with single dyestuffs. He said he would be glad to make a careful study of the new colors as soon as he was furnished with samples of them. It would be necessary to consider the fastness to light, water and weathering of the red and blue dyes which are reasonably near to the colors selected, especially in comparison with the fastness of the old colors.

Dr. Burgess asked if a change in color would require an Executive Order, to which Capt. DuBose replied: "No, it would mean simply change the specification, but we hope an Executive Order will be issued which will insure that all flags are made according to the specification. There is another specification and that is the proportion of the flag."

Mr. Mowbray and Mr. Appel considered the blue color in the flag, Mr. Mowbray saying that it is not a true blue--it is not ultramarine nor cobalt. Mr. Appel said "But the dye from which that was made had a single entity of color. Ultramarine pigment is always pretty much the same. We have many many different dyes which are dye blue". Mr. Mowbray replied, "Well the stress I have laid is there is too much reddish in the blue and blue in the red. The more you can eliminate these elements, the purer the individual colors."

Dr. Burgess then said that the problem resolves itself into determining on the exact colors of red and blue, the testing of these colors here in the Bureau of Standards, and ascertaining from commercial concerns the relative cost and information as to their durability.

Capt. DuBose advised that the sample flag prepared for the Commission of Fine Arts was made at the Navy Yard in New York, and detailed information concerning it can be readily obtained.

Mr. Mowbray then called attention to the importance of considering the United States flag as a national emblem, which should not be submerged in commercial considerations--that was the feeling of the Fine Arts Commission.

Dr. Burgess said the question of cost of colors should not be so much different, as it would be selecting simply a different kind of red and blue, and in securing material from manufacturers simply strips would be sufficient.

Commenting on the colors, Mr. Appel said: "It is much easier to match any given color with the more fugitive dyes than it is to find a fast dye to match the color. I have always had the feeling with reference to the flag colors that after a certain red and blue are decided upon as the colors wanted, then we should examine all commercially available dyes to find a single dyestuff that has satisfactory fastness properties and also comes somewhere near the standard color. It is not likely that one will be found which exactly reproduces the standard color. We may then find it desirable to shift our standard color a little in order that its ready reproduction with dyes of the desired fastness may be

commercially practicable. Cheaper flags which need not be dyed with fast colors may readily be dyed to match any standard color." Of course, we have to know in the first place just what degree of fastness is required of the best grade service flags.

Mr. Caemmerer called attention to the report received from the American Flag Association, transmitting sample French flags, which were forwarded from France by Col. T. Bentley Mott, Military Attache at Paris, and referred to the Commission of Fine Arts for consideration in connection with this subject. In reply to the question whether these French flags were to be considered further, Mr. Mowbray said that he did not think they need be further considered; that the sample flag furnished by the Navy Department with the additional samples of colors he had prepared for the Bureau of Standards should be sufficient.

Dr. Burgess then said, "The flag in the rear is the flag the Fine Arts Commission wants. I think we have to take the Fine Arts Commission on that subject. Now the question is, can it be produced?"

Mr. Mowbray advised that the size and proportion are pretty well agreed upon and the Flag Standardization Committee is thoroughly in sympathy with it.

Commenting on the sample flag, Mr. Caemmerer said, "The question of Flag Standardization, as it was submitted by the Department of Commerce, has been before the Committee and the Commission of Fine Arts for two years, and all are practically agreed upon the sample flag furnished by the Navy Department and which is here exhibited. Every phase of the subject has been carefully considered, and about the only point on which there is not a unanimous opinion is in the matter of inverting every other star in the union. This flag manufacturers dislike doing because of increase involved in cost of production."

Mr. Mowbray said that inverting the stars, every other one, gives more lustre to the union and the appearance of a constellation, but that it was not absolutely necessary to invert them.

Continuing, Mr. Caemmerer said, "The modular standard of measurement agreed upon for the flag, and according to which the sample flag was made, is 13 to 21, with the union as 7 is to 9, and the star-circle diameter $\frac{3}{4}$ of the width of the stripe. The representative of one of the leading flag manufacturers in this country has endorsed the proposed change from the decimal to the modular standard of measurement for the flag. It would seem, therefore, with the question of color settled, steps may be taken to draw up a tentative draft of the proposed Executive Order."

Capt. DuBose said it would be necessary to determine on the sizes of flags to be manufactured. As to fringes on flags, Capt. DuBose said there is nothing to prevent anyone from placing them on the flag, but an order should be issued to prohibit them. The flag is an emblem without fringes.

Mr. McGowan called attention to the importance of considering the texture which should be used for the flags. It should be considered in connection with the colors, as it involves the question of durability of the flags.

In conclusion Dr. Burgess requested Mr. Appel to make a thorough study of the red and blue proposed for the flag, and of which Mr. Mowbray left additional samples. The sample flags furnished the Commission of Fine Arts were also left in the care of Mr. Appel. Mr. Mowbray said to Mr. Appel that this problem of reaching a solution as to the colors now rested with him.

Mr. Appel said it would require possibly six weeks to obtain the necessary data after working samples of the red and blue bunting were received from the Navy Department. Outdoor exposure tests would require much longer than that. The Committee agreed to meet again at the Bureau of Standards as soon as Mr. Appel is ready with his report.

EXHIBIT G.

